



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,289	06/24/2003	Heinrich Hofmann	P/22-230	3250
2352	7590	04/27/2006	EXAMINER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			RODRIGUEZ, PAMELA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3683	
DATE MAILED: 04/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/603,289	HOFMANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Pam Rodriguez	3683	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Pam Rodriguez. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Michael Markowitz. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 24 April 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Vignotto et al.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required  
 4/29/06

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

#### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

##### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

#### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Markowitz contacted the examiner prior to filing an RCE on the instant application. In particular, Mr. Markowitz faxed proposed amendments to Claim 7, the remaining rejected independent claim in the application (see attached). The examiner felt that the claim amendment proposed in Alternative 2 would most likely define over the Vignotto et al reference, in particular the pin element 38 of the reference. However, upon receipt of applicant's formally filed amendment/RCE, the examiner would have to update her search based on any changes to Claim 7 and re-search and reconsider the amendment(s) at that time..

**OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP**

1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036-8403

TEL 212 382 0700 FAX 212 382 0888 FAX 212 398 0681

email@ostrolenk.com

**PARTNERS**SAMUEL H. WEINER  
ROBERT C. FABER  
MAX MOSKOWITZ  
JAMES A. FINDER  
WILLIAM O. GRAY, III  
LOUIS C. DUMICHCHARLES P. LAPOLLA  
DOUGLAS A. MIRO  
PETER S. SLOANE**ASSOCIATES**JOEL I. FELBER\*\*  
KOUROSH SALEHI\*\*  
DOUGLAS Q. HAHN  
GLEN R. PARBANISH  
MICHAEL I. MARKOWITZ  
CHARLES P. GUARINOKEITH J. BARKAUS  
JEFF KIRSNER  
ART C. CODY  
ERICKA K. DEWEY  
KELLY M. BARGMANN**OF COUNSEL**MARTIN PFEFFER  
LAWRENCE A. HOFFMAN  
MARTIN J. BERAN  
PAUL GRANDINETTI\*  
MARK A. FARLEY  
STEVEN R. RUBIN**WASHINGTON OFFICE**1725 K STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006  
TEL 202 457 7785  
FAX 202 429 8919\*DC BAR  
\*\*CONNECTICUT BAR**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET**DATE: April 21, 2006NUMBER OF PAGES, INCLUDING COVER: 4

TO:

NAME/COMPANY	FACSIMILE NO.	
Commissioner for Patents	(571) 273-7122	<input type="checkbox"/> SUCCESSFULLY FAXED
Attention: Examiner Pamela Rodriguez Group Art Unit: 3683		
		<input type="checkbox"/> SUCCESSFULLY FAXED
		<input type="checkbox"/> SUCCESSFULLY FAXED

FROM: Michael I. Markowitz, Esq.OFGS FILE NO.: P/22-230 RETURN TO: Carol Kupferberg**IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE ALL THE PAGES, PLEASE PHONE (212) 382-0700 AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.**

This message is intended only for the use of the individual(s) to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address by mail. Thank you.

**MESSAGE:**

Re: OFGS Ref.: P/22-230

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/603,289

CONNECTION BETWEEN A WHEEL BEARING AND A WHEEL CARRIER

As per our telephone interview on April 18, 2006, attached is our PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE AMENDMENTS TO CLAIM 7.

00763197.1

**DRAFT - FOR EXAMINER'S USE ONLY**

P/22-230

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Heinrich Hofmann, et al.

Serial No.: 10/603,289

Filed: June 24, 2003

Date: April 21, 2006

Group Art Unit: 3683

Examiner: Pamela Rodriguez

For: CONNECTION BETWEEN A WHEEL BEARING AND A WHEEL CARRIER

---

**VIA FACSIMILE - (571) 273-7122**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attention: Examiner Pamela Rodriguez

**PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE AMENDMENTS TO CLAIM 7****Alternative #1**

7. A connection between a wheel bearing and a wheel carrier comprising:  
connecting elements fasteners only connecting the wheel carrier and a fixed part of the  
wheel bearing; and  
at least one projection, integrated with at least one of the fixed part of the wheel  
bearing, the wheel carrier and the connecting elements, transmitting to the wheel carrier a torque  
acting in the fixed part of the wheel bearing during braking;  
the fixed part of the wheel bearing structured to couple to a brake caliper.

00763129.1

Alternative #2

7. A connection between a wheel bearing and a wheel carrier comprising:  
connecting elements only connecting the wheel carrier and a fixed part of the  
wheel bearing; and  
at least one projection, integrated with at least one of the fixed part of the wheel  
bearing, the wheel carrier and the connecting elements, transmitting to the wheel carrier a torque  
acting in the fixed part of the wheel bearing during braking, at least one of said projections  
having a hole therethrough;  
the fixed part of the wheel bearing structured to couple to a brake caliper.

REMARKS FOR ALTERNATIVE #1

Antecedent basis for this first alternative amendment is found in the specification, for example, on page 4, lines 10-11, and 18-19, and in the drawings, for example, in Figs. 2 and 3.

The first alternative amendment is meant to deal with the Examiner's contention in the Advisory Action, that holes 37 in Vignotto et al. can be construed as "elements." It is respectfully submitted that the word "fasteners" distinguishes over holes 37 in Vignotto et al.

REMARKS FOR ALTERNATIVE #2

The second alternative amendment is meant to deal with the Examiner's contention that element 38 (a pin) in Vignotto et al. is equivalent to the at least one projection in claim 7. By specifying that at least one projection has a hole therethrough, supported, for example, by Figs. 2, 3, and 4 of the application drawings, it is respectfully submitted that the at least one projection in claim 7 distinguishes over pin 38 in Vignotto et al.